UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,842	03/31/2004	Shaula Alexander Yemini	EMC-05-098(PRO)ORD	6059

24227   7590   08/17/2009

EMC CORPORATION
OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL
176 SOUTH STREET
HOPKINTON, MA 01748

EXAMINER
KIM, EUNHEE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2123	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/17/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>28 May 2009</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *See Continuation Sheet* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *See Continuation Sheet* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *1, 72, 88, 147, 150, 151 and 205* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

 Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 1-6, 20-33, 42, 44-45, 62, 64-73, 87-93, 107-118, 127, 129-130, 147-152, 165-177, 185, 187-188, 205-209, 223-224, 233, 236, 238-241, 255-268, 276-277, 279-280, 297-301, and 303-319.

 Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims rejected are 1-6,20-33,42,44,45,62,64-73,87-93,107-118,127,129,130,147-152,165-177,185,187,188,205-209,223,224,233,236,238-241,255-268,276,277,279,280,297-301 and 303-319.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The amendment filed 05/28/2009 has been received and considered.

Claims 1-6, 20-33, 42, 44-45, 62, 64-73, 87-93, 107-118, 127, 129-130, 147-152, 165-177, 185, 187-188, 205-209, 223-224, 233, 236, 238-241, 255-268, 276-277, 279-280, 297-301, and 303-319 are presented for examination.

Claim Objections

2.   Claim 1, 72, 88, 147, 150, 151 and 205 are objected to because of the following informalities:

As per Claim 1 and 62, it recites the word "; wherein" in line 7 (Claim 1) and line 6 (Claim 62) which would be better ", wherein".

As per Claims 72, 150, and 151, they are active claims which also have a corresponding cancelled claim number. It is suggested that applicant cancel all of the claims which had duplicate numbers and add them as new claims after the last claim in the list to avoid any possible problems in the future.

As per claim 88, it recites the limitation "based on said function" in step (e). It is unclear what the limitation refers. What does it further limit?

As per claim 147, it recites the limitation "based on said processing means;" in step (e). It is unclear what the limitation refers. What does it further limit?

As per Claim 205, it recites the phrase "based on said processing" in line 4 of the step (b) which would be better "based on said processing,".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Interpretation

"Realms" are interpreted as OOP Objects representing real world business concepts based

on the applicants' disclosure regarding "realms" on page 14 lines 26-27 and on page 15 lines 1-4.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on
> sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3.   Claims 1-5, 20-33, 44-45, 62, 64-72, 87-92, 107-118, 129-130, 147-151, 165-177, 187-

188, 205-208, 223-224, 236, 238-240, 255-268, 276, 279-280, 297-300, and 303-304, 306-307,

309-310, 312-313, 315-319 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Bowman-Amuah (US Patent No. 6,289,382).

Bowman-Amuah discloses (Claims 1, 62, 88, 147, 205, and 236) a method, an apparatus

(Fig. 1), computer readable medium (Fig. 1), and storage device (Fig. 1 and 124) for modeling a

system having one or more components (Fig. 10), comprising:

(Claims 1, 88, 147) (a) dividing said system into one or more components (Fig. 10-14 and

36, Col. 105 lines 7-50, Col. 115 lines 27-48, Col. 6 lines 16-63, Col. 124 lines 5-21, Col. 126

lines 2-66, Col. 127 lines 1-11, Col. 128 lines 6-29, Col. 153 lines 29-37, Col. 283 lines 13-39);

(Claims 1, 62, 88, 147, 205, 236) (b) defining a plurality of realms, wherein each of said

realms contains objects representing attributes and relationships of selected ones of said one or

more components, wherein said one or more components represented include at least one

physical element of the system; wherein each of said plurality of realms contains at least one

object common to at least two of said plurality of realms (Fig. 26-47 and 54 and the description,

Col. 11 liens 66-67, Col. 12 lines 11-19, Col. 115 lines 27-48, Col. 124 lines 5-21, Col. 126 lines

2-66, Col. 127 lines 1-43, Col. 128 lines 6-29, Col. 129 lines 23-32, Col. 153 lines 29-37, Col.

283 lines 13-39);

(Claims 1, 62, 88, 147, 205, 236) (c) defining associations between realms to unify

objects in said realms, wherein said associations represent at least one object common to at least

two of said realms (Fig. 36, Col. 115 lines 27-48, Col. 117 lines 1-22, Col. 124 lines 5-21, Col.

126 lines 2-66, Col. 127 lines 1-43, Col. 128 lines 6-29, Col. 153 lines 29-37, Col. 283 lines 13-

39);

(Claims 1, 62, 88, 147, 236) (d) unifying objects in said realms based on said associations

(Fig. 36, Col. 115 lines 27-48, Col. 6 lines 16-63, Col. 117 lines 1-22, Col. 124 lines 5-21, Col.

126 lines 2-66, Col. 127 lines 1-11, Col. 128 lines 1-61, Col. 153 lines 29-37, Col. 283 lines 13-

39); and

(Claims 1, 62, 88, 147, 236) (e) processing a function in a realm independent of said

other realms, and based on said processing propagating a behavior of one of the unified objects

of one realm to said unified object of another realm using at least one association between the

one realm and the another realm. (Fig. 36, Col. 115 lines 27-48, Col. 6 lines 16-63, Col. 117 lines

1-22, Col. 124 lines 5-21, Col. 126 lines 2-66, Col. 127 lines 1-11, Col. 128 lines 1-61, Col. 153

lines 29-37, Col. 283 lines 13-39);

(Claims 1, 62, 88, 147, 236) (f) propagating a behavior, based on a result of said function,

of one of the unified objects of said first realm to said unified object of a second realm of said

plurality of realms using said at least one association between the first realm and the second

realm to determine the impact of the function of the first realm in the second realm. (Fig. 36, 73-76 and the description, Col. 33 lines 50-56, Col. 78 lines 63-67, Col. 126 lines 2-66, Col. 283 lines 47-67)

(Claim 2) combining results thereof based on said associations of said two or more realms (Fig. 73-76 and the description, Col. 33 lines 50-56, Col. 78 lines 63-67, Col. 126 lines 2-66, Col. 283 lines 47-67);

(Claims 89, 148) the step of unified processing of two or more realms by performing processing in each of said two or more realms, and combining results thereof based on said associations of said two or more realms (Fig. 1-195, Col. 33 lines 50-56, Col. 78 lines 63-67, Col. 126 lines 2-66, Col. 283 lines 47-67);

(Claims 3, 71, 90, 149, 206, 238) an enterprise management system (Col. 26 lines 64-67, Col. 132 lines 1-10);

(Claim 317) at least one realm modeling application components (Fig. 1-195, Col. 31 lines 45-60);

(Claims 4, 72, 91, 150, 207, 239, 304, 318) wherein said realms comprise at least one realm modeling business service components and at least one realm modeling infrastructure components (Fig. 1-195, Col. 31 lines 45-60);

(Claims 5, 92, 151, 208, 240, 297, 298, 303, 306, 307, 310, 312, 313, 319) wherein the unified processing identifies infrastructure problems impacting applications, applications impacting services, or infrastructure problems impacting services (Fig. 1-195, Col. 103 lines 19-27, Col. 78 lines 63-67, Col. 153 lines 30-37);

(Claims 20, 87, 107, 165, 223, 255) wherein said system comprises a network, and wherein said plurality of realms comprises at least one realm modeling network infrastructure components and at least one realm modeling network security components (Col. 29 lines 46-58, Col. 34 lines 22-24, Col. 52 lines 17-60, Col. 56 lines 6-10, Col. 62 lines 15-40, Col. 67 lines 58-67, Col. 78 lines63-67, Col. 80 lines 20-33, Col. 86 lines 33-50, Col. 98 lines 53-58, Col. 115 lines 49-67);

(Claims 21, 256, 258) wherein the step of defining a plurality of realms and defining associations is performed manually (Fig. 1-195, Col. 101 lines 45-56, Col. 105 lines 3-18);

(Claims 22, 257, 259) wherein the step of defining a plurality of realms is performed automatically based on given properties of said one or more components (Col. 53 lines 22-47, Col.105 lines 3-49, Col. 116 lines 53-63, Col. 129 lines 11-57);

(Claim 23) wherein the step of defining associations is performed manually (Fig. 1-195, Col. 101 lines 45-56, Col. 105 lines 3-18);

(Claim 24) wherein the step of defining associations is performed automatically based on given properties of said objects (Col. 53 lines 22-47, Col.105 lines 3-49, Col. 116 lines 53-63, Col. 129 lines 11-57);

(Claims 25, 110, 168, 260) wherein the step of defining associations comprises identifying objects in different realms representing the same component (Fig. 1-195, Col. 101 lines 45-56);

(Claims 26, 64, 111, 169, 261) substantially identical objections (Fig. 1-195, Col. 101 lines 45-56, Col. 105 lines 3-49, Col. 125 lines 26-50);

(Claims 27, 65, 112, 170, 262) different objections (Fig. 1-195, Col. 105 lines 3-49, Col. 125 lines 26-50);

(Claims 28, 66, 113, 171, 263) wherein the objects in different realms have different attributes (Fig. 1-195, Col. 105 lines 3-49);

(Claims 29, 67, 114, 172, 264) wherein the step of defining associations comprises defining a relationship object between objects in different realms (Fig. 1-195, Col. 105 lines 3-49, Col.. 128 lines 6-29, Col. 283 lines 8-67);

(Claims 30, 68, 115, 173, 265) wherein said plurality of realms are defined based on selecting subsets of components in said system (Fig. 1-195, Col. 105 lines 3-49, Col. 247 lines 29-65, Col. 261 lines 7-20);

(Claims 31, 69, 116, 174, 266) wherein said plurality of realms are defined based on different perspectives of the same component in said system (Fig. 1-195, Col. 105 lines 3-49, Col. 247 lines 29-65);

(Claims 32, 70, 117, 175, 267) wherein said plurality of realms are defined based on different levels of abstraction of the same component in said system (Fig. 1-195, Col. 105 lines 3-49, Col. 247 lines 29-65);

(Claims 33, 118, 176, 177, 224, 268) wherein said unified processing is selected from the group consisting of: monitoring (Col. 92 lines 5-62, Col. 115 lines 49-60), analyzing (Col. 127 lines 1-11, Col. 144 lines 56-63), control (Col. 115 lines 49-60, Col. 130 lines 5-17), simulation (Col. 139 lines 21-30, Col. 151 lines 22-35), visualization (Col. 33 lines 15-22, Col. 188 lines 8-10, Col. 212 lines 41-45, Col. 251 lines 60-67, Col. 252 lines 7-18), configuration (Col. 122 lines 16-25, Col. 124 lines 5-20, Col. 145 lines 16-23, Col. 252 lines 7-18), provisioning (Col. 139

lines 21-30, Col. 251 lines 60-67, Col. 252 lines 7-18) and design of said system (Col. 144 lines

56-63);

(Claim 276) propagation of behaviors of said system of said system across realms (Fig. 1-

195, Col. 246 lines 29-37);

(Claims 44, 129, 187, 279) wherein the step of dividing said system comprise the step of

defining said plurality of realms based on one or more models of said system or portions thereof

(Fig. 1-195, Col. 105 lines 1-49);

(Claims 45, 130, 188, 280) wherein said realms are defined by adding associations to one

or more pre-existing models of the system (Fig. 1-195, Col. 105 lines 1-49);

(Claims 108, 166) wherein the step of dividing is automated based on given properties of

said one or more components (Col. 53 lines 22-47, Col.105 lines 3-49, Col. 116 lines 53-63, Col.

129 lines 11-57);

(Claims 109, 167) wherein the step of defining association is performed automatically

based on given properties of said one or more components (Col. 53 lines 22-47, Col.105 lines 3-

49, Col. 116 lines 53-63, Col. 129 lines 11-57);

(Claims 299, 315) wherein the step of unifying is performed manually (Fig. 1-195, Col.

101 lines 45-56, Col. 105 lines 3-18);

(Claim 309) wherein said realms further include at least one realm modeling application

components (Col. 29 lines 46-58, Col. 34 lines 22-24, Col. 52 lines 17-60, Col. 56 lines 6-10,

Col. 62 lines 15-40, Col. 67 lines 58-67, Col. 78 lines63-67, Col. 80 lines 20-33, Col. 86 lines

33-50, Col. 98 lines 53-58, Col. 115 lines 49-67);

(Claims 300, 316) wherein the step of unifying is performed automatically (Fig. 1-195,

Col. 101 lines 45-56, Col. 105 lines 3-18).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459

(1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness
      or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the

claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out

the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c)

and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4.   Claims 6, 73, 93, 152, 209, and 241 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Bowman-Amuah (US Patent No. 6,289,382), and further in view of Semeria

(Multiprotocol Label Switching: Enhancing Routing in the New Public Network).

Bowman-Amuah teach most all of the instant invention as applied to claims 1-5, 20-33,

44-45, 62, 64-72, 87-92, 107-118, 129-130, 147-151, 165-177, 187-188, 205-208, 223-224, 236,

238-240, 255-268, 276, 279-280, 297-300, and 303-304, 306-307, 309-310, 312-313, 315-319

above.

Bowman-Amuah teaches wherein said system is selected from the group consist of an

engineering system (Col. 16 lines 51-61, Col. 125 lines 24-50), a distributed system (Col. 49

lines 15-30, Col. 52 lines 16-33, Col. 94 lines 60-67), an application server system (Col. 26 lines

20-23, Col. 33 lines 57-67, Col. 95 lines1-8), a networked system (Col. 55lines 45-49, Col. 62

lines 15-40), an optical network (Fig. 1-195), a wireless network (Col. 58 lines 61-67, Col. 91

lines 5-25), an IP network (Col. 60 lines 19-32, Col. 63 lines 32-36, Col. 64 lines 34-39, Col. 88

lines 59-67, Col. 90 lines 57-61), a layered network (Col. 56 lines 6-10, Col. 71 lines15-59, Col.

79 lines 49-62, Col. 86 lines 36-60, Col. 89 lines 30-40, Col. 237 lines 50-58), a messaging

system (Col. 56-63, Col. 38 lines 57-62, Col. 55 lines 62-63, Col. 64 lines 40-67, Col. 212 lines

40-45, Col. 237 lines 50-58), an ERP system (Col. 1 lines 20-26, Fig. 1-195), a dynamic system

(Col. 32 lines 29-37, Col. 230 lines 48-55, Col. 294 lines 36-59), a static system (Col. 32 lines

29-37, Col. 283 lines 47-67), a utility computing system, an autonomic computing system, a grid

system, an on-demand system or an adaptive system (Fig. 1-195, Col. 71 lines 15-42, Col. 99

lines 19-27, Col. 108 lines 60-64), except Multi-Protocol Label Switching Virtual Private

Network.

Semeria teaches Multi-Protocol Label Switching Virtual Private Network (Page 15,

Figure 9 and 11).

Bowman-Amuah and Semeria are analogous art because they are both related to network

system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of at the time the

invention was made to include Multi-Protocol Label Switching Virtual Private Network of

Semeria, in the method of manufacture for a globally addressable interface in communication

services framework of Bowman-Amuah because Multi-Protocol Label Switching Virtual Private

Network is a well known process in a method for manufacture for a globally addressable

interface in communication services framework, and Semeria teaches advantages of improved

Multi-Protocol Label Switching Virtual Private Network that permits ISPs to deliver new

services that cannot be readily supported by conventional IP routing techniques and enhance

routing capabilities by supporting more than just destination-based forwarding (Summary).

5.   Claims 42, 127, 185, 233, 277, 301, 305, 308, 311, are 314 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowman-Amuah (US Patent No. 6,289,382), and further in

view of McGee et al. (US Pub. No 2003/0079160).

Bowman-Amuah teach most all of the instant invention as applied to claims 1-5, 20-33,

44-45, 62, 64-72, 87-92, 107-118, 129-130, 147-151, 165-177, 187-188, 205-208, 223-224, 236,

238-240, 255-268, 276, 279-280, 297-300, and 303-304, 306-307, 309-310, 312-313, 315-319

above.

Bowman-Amuah fails to teach (Claims 42, 127, 185, 233, 277) root cause analysis of events in said system and correlation of events in said system (Claims 301, 305, 308, 311, 314) event correlation of said system.

McGee et al. teaches (Claims 42, 127, 185, 233, 277) root cause analysis of events in said system of events in said system and correlation of events in said system (Paragraph [0054] and [0058]); and

(Claims 301, 305, 308, 311, 314) correlation of events of said system (Paragraph [0054] and [0058]).

Bowman-Amuah and McGee et al. are analogous art because they are both related to an enterprise networked system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of at the time the invention was made to include root cause analysis of events and correlation of events of McGee et al., in the method of manufacture for a globally addressable interface in communication services framework of Bowman-Amuah because root cause analysis of events and correlation of events is a well known process in a method for manufacture for a globally addressable interface in communication services framework.

McGee et al. teaches advantages system that allows for users by a system manager, such as a web-based enterprise system manager, to assist, to achieve maintenance of Service Level Agreements in terms of system performance (Paragraph [0026] and [0051]).

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments filed 05/28/2009 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Examiner respectfully withdraws *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112* in view of the

amendment and/or applicant's arguments.

Applicants have argued that:

> However, Applicants respectfully assert that <u>Bowman does not disclose "wherein each of</u>
> <u>said plurality of realms contains at least one object common to at least two of said</u>
> <u>plurality of realms</u>." Bowman describes "break[ing] down large complex problems into
> smaller, cohesive elements.., model the business in terms of real-world business
> concepts," where the claims states that the "plurality of realms contains.., object common
> to at least two of said.., realms."
> Applicants assert that Bowman contains no such "object common to at least.., realms,"
> rather Bowman seems to simply be dividing the elements into "smaller, cohesive
> elements."

Examiner disagrees as Bowman teaches Partitioned Business Components (Realm) which

keeps the encapsulation (object common to realms) that is defined at the Business

Components (Realm) since Partitioned Business Components is descend from the Business

Components (Col. 127 lines 20-23).

Applicants have argued that:

> Second, Applicants assert that Bowman does not disclose "defining associations between
> said plurality of realms to unify objects in said plurality of realms, wherein said
> associations represent an identification of said at least one object common to at least two
> of said plurality of realms" or "unifying objects in said realms based on said associations
> that said at least one object is common to at least two of said plurality of realms." The
> cited portion of Bowman for this claim feature is Col. 126 line 51-67 and col. 127 line 1-
> 43). Here, Bowman is discussing "break[ing] down large complex problems into smaller,
> cohesive elements.., model the business in terms of real-world business concepts."
> However, Applicants respectfully assert that this is not equivalent to "unif[y] ling] objects

in said plurality of realms, wherein said associations represent an identification of said at least one object common to at least two of said plurality of realms." Rather, Bowman is using modeling to partition a business component into partitioned business components." In contrast, Applicants are unifying "objects in said plurality of realms" where Bowman is "break[ing] down."

Examiner disagrees as Bowman teaches Business components that are transformed into partitioned Business Components with keeping the encapsulation (Col. 127 lines 20-23), not breaking down.

Given the claim broadest reasonable interpretation, it is Examiner's position that the process of transforming is corresponding to "unifying objects".

Applicants have argued that:

> Third, Applicants respectfully assert that Bowman does not disclose "propagating a behavior, based on a result of said function, of one of the unified objects of said first realm to said unified object of a second realm of said plurality of realms using said at least one association between the first realm and the second realm to determine the impact of the function of the first realm in the second realm." The cited portion asserted to correspond to claimed this feature is Bowman Col. 128 lines 1-61. Here, Bowman describes how "Business Components.. . encapsulate information... [and] the behaviors and rules associated with those entities." Here again, Bowman is describing how he divides a "complex problem" into "smaller problems." <u>However, Applicants assert Bowman does not disclose "unified objects" and therefore can not disclose "propagating a behavior .... based on... a function .... of one of the unified objects." As well, Applicants respectfully assert that Bowman does not disclose "propagation .... to determine the impact of the function of the first realm in the second realm ...... based on...of one of the unified objects."</u>

Applicants have merely alleged that Bowman does not teach the limitation "unified objects" without clearly pointing out how the transforming (Col. 127 lines 20-23) is not same as claimed invention. Given the claim broadest reasonable interpretation, it is Examiner's position that Bowman teaches the cited limitation as "Business Components... not only do they encapsulate behaviors and rules, but also the information that is associated with those

process", "Process-centric Business components are "in control", while entity centric

Business Components do what they're told" "Business Components controls the flow of a

business process by requesting services in a specific sequence according to specific business

rules").Bowman teaches Business Components that controls the flow of a business process

by requesting services in a specific sequence according to specific business rules (Col. 128

lines 1-61) are corresponding to "propagating a behavior based on a function".

Conclusion

7.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Eunhee Kim whose telephone number is 571-272-2164. The

examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul

Rodriguez can be reached on 571-272-3753. The fax phone number for the organization where

this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be

obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Eunhee Kim/
Examiner, Art Unit 2123

/Paul L Rodriguez/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2123